REMARKS

Applicants filed an RCE and Submission on March 28, 2006. The Examiner's comments in Box 11 on page 2 of the Advisory Action were noted and tests have been performed and are submitted herein by way of Declaration of Ms. Takahashi to respond to the Examiner's comments. A more detailed discussion follows:

In Continuation Box 11, the Examiner points out that a PET substrate or blue-tinted PET substrate will have transmission densities within the claimed range. Technically, this is not correct because a PET substrate generally has a transmission density in the range of 0.04, see, for example, page 40, line 15 of the Application, however, this is not the transmission density limitation of the present Invention. The transmission density of the present Invention is the transmission density across or through the combined hydrophilic layer and flexible support. Furthermore, this means that, if there is an underlayer between the hydrophilic layer and the flexible support, the transmission density is being measured across the flexible support, the underlayers and the hydrophilic layer. Thus, the transmission density, as recited in the claims, takes

into account the flexible support and the hydrophilic layer as well as any layers which come therebetween.

Turning to Inoue, he does not teach a plastic support having a hydrophilic layer thereon. In fact, in the examples of Inoue, a heat-sensitive layer, which is the image forming layer, is provided directly on the aluminum plate support. Thus, even if one replaced the aluminum support with a plastic support, one does not arrive at the present Invention because a plastic support, such as a PET support, will have a transmission density in the range of 0.04. In other words, a transmission density that is too small to be in the claimed range.

Applicants have prepared a sample in accordance with Inoue using a PET support and those results are also reported by way of a Declaration herein. Not unsurprising, the support does not meet the transmission density limitation because the support doesn't have a hydrophilic layer, let alone any underlayers.

Applicants have also tested the glossiness of the material in accordance with Inoue and have shown that Inoue's material does not meet the glossiness limitation of the present Invention. Furthermore, because Inoue does not teach nor

suggest the glossiness limitation, it is respectfully submitted that he cannot either anticipate or make obvious the glossiness limitation that is recited in the claims. As the Examiner recognizes, in order for Inoue to teach something inherently, his product must always result in that limitation. The tests, as reported in the Declaration attached hereto, clearly demonstrate that Inoue's material does not inherently possess the glossiness limitation.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the claims presented herein are patentable over the teachings of Inoue.

Applicants would also like to direct the Examiner's attention to Claims 9 and 19 of the present Application. Claims 9 and 19 require that the hydrophilic layer contain metal oxide particles. It is submitted that nothing in Inoue teaches or suggests the use of metal oxide particles in a hydrophilic layer not to mention the fact that Inoue doesn't teach use of a hydrophilic layer on his support.

In view of the foregoing and the attached Declaration, it is respectfully submitted that the Application is in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. Should any fees or extensions of time be necessary in order to maintain this Application in pending condition, appropriate requests are hereby made and authorization is given to debit Account # 02-2275.

Respectfully submitted,

LUCAS & MERCANTI, LLP

By: Donald C. Lucas

Donald C. Lucas, 31,275
Attorney for Applicant(s)
475 Park Avenue South, 15th Floor
New York, NY 10016
Tel. # 212-661-8000

Encl: Executed Declaration of Ms. Rieko Takahashi